DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 183 108 HE 012 364

AUTHOR Finkelstein, Martin J.
TITLE Understanding American Academics: What Have We Learned and Where Do We Go From Here? Occasional Papers Series No. 6.
INSTITUTION State Univ. of New York, Buffalo. Dept. of Higher Education.
PUB DATE Jan 80
NOTE 60p.
AVAILABLE FROM Department of Higher Education, 479 Baldy Hall, State University of New York at Buffalo, Buffalo, NY 14260

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; *Educational History; Educational Research; Higher Education; Literature Reviews; Research Methodology; *Research Projects; *Social Science Research; *Teacher Role

ABSTRACT

An overview of the academic profession in America is presented, and many of the studies of this topic are categorized into a coherent framework. A search of the research literature on college and university faculty appearing in the post-World War II period was conducted. The two preemptive sources of knowledge about faculty were doctoral dissertations and the research reports of academic social scientists. Other sources of knowledge about faculty are noted. The report was designed to bring together the scattered, largely inaccessible results of social scientific and dissertation research on faculties and the research on different aspects of the faculty role and different types of faculty. In addition to generalizations about academic people, results of a content analysis of the research literature are presented. Some substantive and methodological suggestions for future inquiry are also offered. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED183108

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

SUNY Buffalo

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

OCCASIONAL PAPERS SERIES

Department of Higher Education
Faculty of Educational Studies
State University of New York at Buffalo

HE012 364

The Occasional Papers Series of the Department of Higher Education is a forum for research and analysis by scholars associated with the Department and its work. The Department of Higher Education, as part of the State University of New York, concerns itself with issues of relevance to New York and the broader higher education community. For information, write to the Chairman, Department of Higher Education, 479 Baldy Hall, State University of New York at Buffalo, Buffalo, N.Y. 14260.

UNDERSTANDING AMERICAN ACADEMICS: WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED AND WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

by

Martin J. Finkelstein
University of Denver

Occasional Paper Number Six

Department of Higher Education
Faculty of Educational Studies
State University of New York at Buffalo

January, 1980

Copyright, 1980

PREFACE

This Occasional Paper, the sixth in the Department of Higher Education's series, focuses on our knowledge of the American academic profession. As Martin Finkelstein points out, everyone involved in higher education has perceptions about the profession, but few, even professionals in the field of higher education, have carefully examined the relevant social science literature on the profession. This Occasional Paper is a cogent examination of some of this literature. Dr. Finkelstein not only provides an excellent overview, but he categorizes many of the studies into a coherent framework. We can obtain for the first time a picture of the orientation of empirical research on the academic profession as well as some useful insights on the profession itself.

Martin J. Finkelstein is Assistant Professor of Higher Education in the School of Education, University of Denver. He has been on the staff of the University Council for Educational Administration. He holds the Ph.D. from the Department of Higher Education, State University of New York at Buffalo.

Philip G. Altbach
E. D. Duryea
Editors, Occasional Papers Series

INTRODUCTION

This monograph is about American academics as objects of social scientific inquiry. It highlights the generalizations about academic people that have emerged over three decades of increasingly intensive study and analyzes the character of the research that spawned them.

The findings reported here are based largely on doctoral dissertation research begun in 1976. As an aspiring academician, with an appropriately abiding faith in research, I was then determined to learn everything I could about my future role as a means of "anticipatory" socialization and career planning. What exposure to the history of American higher education I had taught me that there was "little new under the sun." Some of the most hotly debated academic issues of the 1960s and 1970s--the conflict between teaching and research, faculty incentives and productivity, adaptation to educational innovation, retrenchment--were also hotly debated from the 1890s to the 1930s. There appeared to be wisdom, then, in adopting a strategy of glancing backward on previous inquiry into the academic profession as a guide to the present--provided that some appropriate standards of scientific rigor be maintained all along.

I recognized, of course, that while certain themes are perennial in higher education, peculiar historical circumstances lend an idiosyncratic quality to the questions we ask and there might not be direct antecedents of my own. I presumed, however, that earlier inquiries might uncover certain general factors, those larger principles of faculty motivation that would be readily adaptable to my own needs--

assuming that both their questions and my own shared a common referent, the same species of thoroughly professionalized academic man that emerged fully at about the time of the Second World War. I proceeded, then, with the view that what was learned about the academic professions during their earlier ascendence was not irrelevant to understanding them in their current hour of stabilization and/or decline.

It was on the basis of these presuppositions that I began a systematic search of the research literature on college and university faculty appearing in the post-war period. During that process, I foraged through several bibliographies, published and unpublished, various abstracts and indexes, computerized and not, and followed up assiduously on the references of references. The search yielded a tangible product: over 300 systematic, empirical studies of post-war faculty. Perhaps, more importantly, it developed a more intangible appreciation for how much had been learned and reported, on the one hand, and how little was actually known by most academic citizens, on the other. The fruits of inquiry were there but largely inaccessible to members of the academy themselves.

The two preemptive sources of knowledge about faculty were doctoral dissertations and the research reports of academic social scientists. The former's findings were, with few exceptions, irretrievably lost to all but the authors' doctoral committee and ungeneralizable beyond the faculty at a single institution. The latter's findings tended to scatter over tens of specialized disciplinary journals in the social sciences and focus on faculty in a single or small range of disciplines.

Beyond these, there were three other sources of knowledge about faculty which, while far smaller in volume, have been decidedly more

available. Most accessible have been the periodic reports in the Chronicle of Higher Education of Ladd and Lispet's biennial faculty surveys. The reports have highlighted responses to a few survey questions but the constraints of a journalistic format have limited their searchingness and scope. These latter qualities have been provided more generously by a spate of trade hardcover books published over the past decade, some of which received considerable attention even in the academic community - most notably, Herbert Livesey's The Professors (1975). While these efforts ofted represent a serious attempt to penetrate "academic knots,"they are at best impressioistic and one-sided in their treatment; at worst, muckraking exposes (can the distinguishing characteristic of professors, qua professors, be that they are lazy, petty, self-seeking?) A far more balanced, scholarly treatment of the academic professions is provided by less than a handful of volumes: Ladd and Lipset's on academic politics (1975), Gaff and Wilson's on the teaching role, Steinberg's on religion and ethnicity (1974), Tuckman's (1976) and Lewis' (1975) on the academic reward system, Blau's (1973) on productivity, and Logan Wilson's (1979) update of his 1942 classic on academics at the major universities. These latter inquiries treat aspects of the academic role or the academic role in a limited range of institutions. Valuable as they are, they leave the typical academic citizen without a sense of the whole.

It was in the service of promoting this holistic view and closing the gap between what is known, on the one hand, and what we as academic citizens know, on the other, that the study reported herein was conceived. Specifically, I had in mind a report that would bring together: (1) the scattered, largely inaccessible results of social scientific and

dissertation research on faculties and (2) research on different aspects of the faculty role and different types of faculty.

With these aims in mind and a pool of research studies already generated, the inquiry proceeded as follows. Each of the research studies was treated as a subject or case and data were collected on twenty-two characteristics from each, including date of research report, dependent variables/topics examined, research strategy, data analysis procedure, sample composition, as well as the findings (recorded as descriptive statistics or the results of tests of statistical significance).

The data on the characteristics of the sample of research studies were subjected to a content analysis and examined to discern trends in research topics and strategies over time. Results of these analyses are fully reported in the original doctoral dissertation (Finkelstein, 1978). In order to synthesize the findings generated by these inquiries, the research studies were grouped by dependent variables/ topic and examined for overall patterns in the findings--i.e., patterns in the outcome of tests of the relationship of all independent variables to each dependent variable/topic. In cases where no consistent overall pattern emerged, the groups of studies organized by topic were further broken down by characteristics of the studies themselves (e.g., type of faculty studied), and I sought to discern patterns within these subgroups of studies. This procedure assumed that while no consistent findings might emerge for faculty as a whole, it might be possible to discern patterns along the lines of disciplinary affiliation or the type of institution in which faculty taught, or along temporal lines--i.e., one kind of relationship may have held in the 1950s and quite another in

the 1970s. Finally, the results of these syntheses were subjected to a second-order analysis in an effort to derive more encompassing generalizations that spanned several dependent variable clusters. These higher order generalizations about academic people constitute the central portion of this report. They are preceded by a glance backward at the historic precursors of the modern academic role and its ultimate crystallization around the Second World War. They are followed by the results of our content analysis of the research literature as they bear on our emerging understanding of American academics. The report concludes with some substansive and methodological suggestions for future inquiry.

THE EMERGENCE OF THE MODERN ACADEMIC ROLE

By the Second World War, nearly 150,000 faculty were instructing some one and a half million students--about 15% of the 18-21 age cohort. American higher education, generally, and the academic profession, in particular, were poised on the brink of their most explosive growth spurt. During the next 30 years, the ranks of the American professoriate were to nearly quadruple. Between 1965-1970 alone, they swelled by 150,000, with the number of new positions exceeding the entire number of slots in 1940 (Ladd and Lipset, 1975). Now 600,000 strong, college and university professors were certifying nearly 40% of the college age population.

This numerical growth caps the ascent of the intellectual and academic professions in the United States--an ascent from very modest circumstances indeed. In less than a century, the professor rose from a makeshift, poorly paid drillmaster and custodian of incorrigible adolescents to the status of a respected public figure--a well-traveled entrepreneur and consultant to Presidents. Before the turn of the century, it is doubtful whether an academic profession existed in any meaningful sense. The academic role as we know it today--as a structured career sequence combining the pursuit of teaching, research and service within the institutional contexts of colleges and universities and disciplinary professional associations--took shape during the emergence of the American graduate university in the closing years of the 19th century. One indeed was a necessary condition for the development of the other. It was not, however, until the Second World War that the academic role in its contemporary guise came to be fully recognizable.

The Pre-Civil War Professor

Nothing could have been further from the minds of faculty teaching in American colleges and universities before the Civil War than the active pursuit of an academic career. Typically, the old time college professor was a young Protestant male (more likely a Presbyterian, Congregationalist, or Unitarian than not) who had been born into a fairly prosperous, New England family (of clerical or business persuasion). He had gotten a classical B.A. degree as preparation for a career in the ministry, law, medicine, or perhaps business. In a few of the best institutions, he may have had a small amount of graduate study. He may have taken up a faculty position (most probably at his alma mater) after some years in a nonacademic career at wages insufficient to support himself, let alone a family. For many younger instructors, their academic position served as a way station between careers or as a stop-over between the end of schooling and the location of an appropriate entry level position in their chosen profession. Some were simply waiting to be called to the pulpit, while others sought the kind of psycho-social moratorium that contemporary students find in college and graduate school (Erikson, 1974). In the case of the more mature professor, an academic appointment may have served as a refuge from failure at, or dissatisfaction with, their chosen career. Whether young or old, the acceptance of an academic appointment in no way implied a regular career pattern. Many eventually left the professoriate to embark on a "real career." The fortunes of those who stayed hung precariously on presidential grace--and such grace was

most often dispensed on the bases of orthodoxy, respectability, and gentility.*

During his sojourn in academe, what did the old-time professor do? In the name of the "permanant instructor of youth," there was very little this jack-of-all-trades did not do. In the first place, he taught a little bit of everything, almost certainly including theology and classical language; almost certainly excluding the area directly related to his own studies. His classes were conducted as classical recitations:

> In a Latin or Greek recitation, one (student) may be asked to read or scan a short passage, another translate it, a third to answer questions as to its construction, and so on; or all this and more may be required of the same individual. The recitor is expected simply to answer the questions which are put to him, but not to ask any of his instructor, or dispute his assertions. If he had any inquiries to make, or controversy to carry on, it must be done informally, after the division has been dismissed. Sometimes, when a wrong translation is made or a wrong answer given, the instructor corrects it forthwith, but more frequently, he makes no sign, though if the failure be almost complete, he may call upon another to go over the ground again. Perhaps after the lesson has been recited, the instructor may translate it, comment upon it, point out the mistakes which have been made and so on. The "advance" (lesson) of one day is always the "review" of the next, and a more perfect recitation is always expected on the second occasion;--a remark which is not confined to the languages but applies equally well to all studies of the course. (Bagg, 1871 as cited by Veysey, 1965, pp. 37-8).

Beyond the classroom, the professor's responsibilities intruded into virtually every aspect of students' lives and characters to insure both piety and probity. In their role as surrogate parent, faculty were

---

*This portrait draws heavily on data reported by McCaughey (1974) and Veysey (1965).

charged with carefully monitoring behavior. Indeed, faculty meetings served almost exclusively as a forum for deliberating on cases of student discipline (Canby, 1936; Haggerty and Works, 1939 as cited by Orr, 1978; Veysey, 1965).

These "instructors of youth" could not be viewed, nor did they view themselves, as academics practicing an honorable, scholarly calling. As Edward Everett explained upon his resignation from Harvard in the early part of the 19th century: "I find the whole pursuit, and the duties it brings with it, not respectable enough in the estimation they bring with them and lead too much into contact with some little men and many little things." (McCaughey, 1974, p. 248).

To be sure, the first stirrings of academic professionalism were discernable well before the Civil War, especially at the better institutions. Since the early part of the 19th century, several thousand Americans had taken graduate study in Germany and had brought back with them the German ideal of the research university. A number of these individuals, men such as Edward Everett and George Ticknor, were offered professorships upon their return and were instrumental in several early efforts to establish graduate education in American universities--Harvard, Michigan, Yale, Columbia, Pennsylvania, Case Western Reserve, University of Virginia, among others. However, their reform efforts largely failed, and they were often exasperated with the level and nature of American higher education (Berelson, 1960). Distracted from their work by rambunctious students or burdensome teaching loads, they were unable to command the respect accorded their German counterparts in the wider community and often left their professorial positions after several years; or, if fortunate, they found protected sinecures to function with virtual autonomy. (McCaughey, 1974).

The Transformation of the Academic Role

It was only in the last quarter of the 19th century that the confluence of a number of social changes and the availability of a model for imitation allowed graduate study and its concommitant specialization to become firmly established in a core dozen or so American universities. The progressive secularization of American society was penetrating the classical college, subjugating the demands of piety to the religion of progress and materialism. At the same time, the rise of science and tremendous growth of scientific knowledge was breaking apart the classical curriculum. Notwithstanding the very power of these social trends, it required nothing less than the founding of a new kind of institution--the graduate research university, as exemplified by John Hopkins and Clark--to galvanize the energy of a core dozen or so universities in the direction of graduate study, so focused was American higher education on the undergraduate. But once graduate specialization took hold in earnest, it was but a short step to the establishment of the major learned societies and their sponsorship of specialized, disciplinary journals: the American Chemical Society in 1876; the Modern Language Association in 1883; the American Historical Association in 1884; the American Psychological Association in 1892; etc. (Berelson, 1960).

These developments provided the American higher educational system with the capability of producing a cohort of graduate-trained specialists and provided clear career opportunities for them. Although touted by some as a veritable "academic revolution," the transformation actually proceeded by gradual steps over a half century as successive cohorts of professors were replaced by the products of the latest

graduate training.* Faculty teaching around the turn of the century had strong ties of loyalty to their alma mater, the disciplinary college, and continued to be shaped by higher education's strong undergraduate and teaching traditions to which graduate study was still only incidental (Canby, 1936).

The professionalization process was quite uneven as well. Within the self-same institution, there were pockets of old and new, often defined along disciplinary lines (Veysey, 1965; McCaughey 1974). Change occurred at different rates in different types of institutions and in different regions of the country, beginning with the large institutions in the East, and "trickling down" toward the small colleges of the West and South. It is most accurate, then, to speak of continuities and discontinuities in the academic role as it manifested itself, quite irregularly, around the turn of the century.

Signs of discontinuity with the past were discernible on several dimensions, most notably , in the work faculty performed. By the end of the 19th century, the "jack-of-all-trades" was quickly losing ground to the specialized expert and the scientific researcher. Faculty were now increasingly teaching in their fields of specialization; and their classroom pedagogy was undergoing a process of diversification greater than any in the previous two hundred years. The classical recitation was increasingly being supplemented by the seminar, the large lecture course, and the scientific laboratory (Veysey, 1965).

Not only were some faculty teaching differently, they were teaching less. Teaching loads were being reduced to allow time for research and other professional activities. While twenty or more classroom hours were still common at many small colleges, professors at the best univer-

---

*McCaughey's (1974) analysis of the professional characteristics of the Harvard faculty over the course of the nineteenth century attests to the gradualness of the change.

sities were only required to spend between ten and fifteen hours in the classroom (Gee, 1932 and Haggerty & Works, 1939, as cited by Orr, 1978; Veysey, 1965). These latter institutions had begun offering, albeit on a small scale, sabbaticals to faculty in order to facilitate their professional pursuits (Veysey, 1965). The spirit of "scientific" research was even spreading to the humanities: the 1890s mark the beginning of the vogue of philological research, the scurrying to track down exact dates and sources and authenticate texts, a transition from the urbane "man-of-letters" to the scientific philologist (Canby, 1936; Veysey, 1965).

Beyond the research act <u>per se</u>, some faculty were now engaged in <u>professional</u> activities of a broader scope. These included participation in the activities of disciplinary professional associations, including service on the editorial review boards of professional association-sponsored journals. Most notable historically, some faculty were pressed into service as expert consultants to state and local governments. This new role is no better illustrated than in what later came to be known as the <u>Wisconsin Idea</u>. During 1910-11, some 33 individuals held official positions both with the state and with the university, mostly as agricultural experts or with the state railroad or tax commission; thirteen others were "on call" at the capital as needed, including political scientists, economists, and lawyers (Veysey, 1965). While hardly 10% of the university faculty was directly involved, and this group included representatives of only a handful of disciplines, the Wisconsin Idea represents an early, and public, recognition by the lay community of the existence and significance of scientific expertise.

This professionalization of faculty in the work role was intimately bound up with the formalization of the professorial career track. Data on changes in Harvard faculty characteristics over the course of the 19th century show that holders of academic appointments came to increasingly view college teaching as a "first choice" career option rather than as a "fallback" or "way station." By 1892, two-thirds had no previous occupation prior to their appointment compared with barely twenty-five percent a half century earlier (McCaughey, 1974). Whereas one-fifth of a sample of faculty at the leading universities still attributed their career choice to a basic dissatisfaction with the ministry and another one-fifth to pure chance, now fully one-third were reporting their primary motivation was interest in scholarship and the scholarly life (Veysey, 1965, pp. 301-02).

By the end of the nineteenth century as well, a concensus had begun to develop on a routine path to that career. The doctoral degree was increasingly perceived as a requisite "union-card" for entry into the professorial ranks at the best universities. Even the small colleges were requiring some graduate work for junior appointment. In the period immediately preceeding the Civil War, one out of seven of the full-time faculty at Harvard had attained a doctorate; by 1892, over one-half had. (McCaughey, 1974, p. 331).

Once appointed, the academician of the 1890s could, for the first time, discern the outlines of an institutional career structure. By the 1890s, most institutions had established a hierarchy of academic ranks, providing a recognized sequence of statuses from instructor through full professor through which the novice might expect to pass (Veysey, 1965). Instructors were no longer required to compete against

each other for the single, illusive professorship. Not only, however, were the goals of the competition differentiated and sequenced, but the rules of the competition were changing as well. Virtually all leading institutions were embracing a new emphasis on research and scholarship as a criterion, alongside that of gentlemanliness, for ascending the newly established hierarchy. This brought one's disciplinary colleagues directly into the institutional stratification system. And here were the first seeds of academic gamesmanship, careerism, and the shifting of faculty loyalties from institutions to their disciplines (Veysey, 1965).

Amidst these unmistakeable signs of changing times, some very basic patterns of an earlier period remained--still modal at most of the colleges and even at some of the leading universities. Most fundamentally, the American professoriate was still a thoroughly homogenous group of upper middle class, New England-born Protestants. Ecclesiastical and business family backgrounds continued their ascendance, although farm families had begun to increase. Among faculty at the leading institutions, over three-fourths had been sired by old New England families; and Protestantism continued as the "professorial religion"--although some of the "lower" Protestant denominations, e.g., Baptists and Methodists, were now rivaling the Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and Unitarians for hegemony. (Veysey, 1965; Kunkel, 1938 as cited by Orr, 1978).

This socioeconomic homogeneity continued to express itself in the stiffness and conformity that had historically marked faculty culture on campus. Faculty were almost "ministerial" in their quest for respectability and maintaining their dignity in front of undergraduates and

the community. Hence, intense colleague pressure rigidly enforced conventions of academic behavior, extending to matters such as the dress of faculty wives, ways of speaking at faculty meetings, as well as the use of alcohol. The campus still set the boundaries of professorial vision, inbreeding remained a positive virtue and loyalty to alma mater was championed at all cost (Canby, 1936). And while such ritualistic conformity may have been more fully characteristic of the more tradition-bound Eastern colleges, it remained operative even at such leading institutions as Columbia, where J.McK. Cattell could create periodic campus furors by flouting the rules of academic etiquette (Veysey, 1965).

Beyond its conformity, academic culture remained a culture apart--insulating its denizens from the mainstream of fast-paced, industrial America. The world of ideas, in general, and the arts and sciences subjects, in particular, were viewed as largely irrelevant in the larger society; and their practitioners commanded little respect and prestige for their efforts--and even less money. The professor was yet perceived as an iconoclast rather than a public figure--and acted the role. This was especially true of faculty in the colleges and in the East, and less fully characteristic of those in the large universities, especially the state universities in the mid and far West, e.g., the University of Wisconsin. But it is well to remember that even at that most celebrated service-oriented institution, no more than ten percent of the faculty were directly involved in service to state government; and those represented only three or four fields (McCarthy, 1930 as cited by Veysey, 1965). Reaching out beyond the campus was still the deviation rather than the rule.

In terms of their institutional status, the modal principal of faculty as mere employee, though increasingly challenged, remained firmly entrenched. No provisions for job security existed and tenure as we know it today was simply unheard of. While many full professors were on an indefinite appointment that simply meant that no term of appointment had been specified on their contract. Indefinite appointments were never the equivalent of permanent appointments, either in intent or law; individuals on such appointments could be dismissed at any time. Practically and legally speaking, even the most senior faculty served at the pleasure of the board of trustees (Metzger, 1971). Moreover, for junior faculty, neither a recognized set of procedures nor a timetable were yet established for attaining even these indefinite appointments that were the rewards of a full professorship. An individual faculty member might serve his institution for fifteen or twenty years and be dismissed at any time without reasons and without a hearing. And this possibility appeared time and again, even at those institutions with a tradition of faculty power such as Yale and Wisconsin (Orr, 1978).

In the absence of job security and legal recourse, faculty remained positively subservient to the administration even at major universities. Even so enlightened a president as Daniel Coit Gilman of John Hopkins did not hesitate to scold the eminent historian Herbert Baxter Adams for leaving a few days before the end of the semester without asking permission; and, a second time, for inviting outside lecturers, again without prior presidential approval (cited by Veysey, 1965, p. 352). Where it existed, faculty government served much the same function as student government, providing a forum at which the administration might "sound out" opinion. While the major drive for faculty control

of the university around the turn of the century resulted in the creation of some academic senates and increased department autonomy in making faculty appointments, whatever power did accrue to faculty was vested in a small group of senior oligarchs--thus effectively reinforcing the pattern of wide disparity between the full professor, on the one hand, and the young instructor, on the other (Veysey, 1965).

Perhaps nowhere was the professoriate's continued ties to the past more evident than in the college classroom. The pervasiveness of the classical recitation diminished only gradually and was replaced by a more up-to-date version. Rather than drilling students on translation of Latin and Greek texts, most professors were now quizzing students, still seated in alphabetical order, on the content of what they read (Canby, 1936). Lectures and seminars did not yet prevail in undergraduate education. The former were most frequent at the leading universities, while the latter were mostly confined to graduate education. Moreover, the faculty/student relationship continued as a basically adversary and impersonal one. In the formality of the classroom, the professor used whatever coercive tactics seemed necessary to cram facts into students' heads. The students, in turn, resisted or were indifferent, using the minimum effort required to get by with a "gentleman's C." By the end of a semester, neither the professor nor the student knew anything about each other's personality. While the curricular modernization of the last quarter of the nineteenth century had eased some of this historic tension, and certainly mollified its expression (riots and the stoning of faculty homes were by now passe and institutions no longer felt the necessity of extracting oaths of allegiance from students), it hadn't erased it. And what attempts were made around the

turn of the century to do so -- in the form of establishing academic advisor and/or tutorial systems, the institutionalization of faculty teas -- were largely unsuccessful. (Veysey, 1965)

Consolidation of the Professional Pattern

The two decades between the First and Second World Wars witnessed an unprecedented growth in graduate study and research. The rate of production of doctorates increased five-fold, from 620 per year in 1920 to nearly 3,300 per year in 1940. More analyses and pronouncements on graduate education were published than in any previous or subsequent 20-year period, except the present. A cycle of intense, second-order specialization was evident in the differentiation of yet more esoteric subareas within the disciplines. The social sciences, for example, spawned in quick succession the Econometric Society (1930), The American Association of Physical Anthropologists (1930), The Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues (1936), The American Society of Criminology (1936), The Rural Sociological Society (1937), The Society for Applied Anthropology (1941), The Economic History Association (1941), et al. And these societies sponsored, in turn, yet more specialized scholarly journals, e.g., Econometrika (1933), Sociometry (1937), Public Administration Review (1940), Journal of Personality (1932), etc. (Berelson, 1960). By the mid-1940s the dominance of the graduate research model as we know it today was clearly established as was the professoriate's claim to that crucial desideratum of professionalization -- specialized expertise.

This widespread recognition of faculty claims of "expertise" or "professional authority" can be directly traced to the expanded role afforded the scholar in public service. The "Brain Trust" assembled by Franklin Roosevelt that addressed the economic and social havoc wrought by the

Depression provided a highly visible, public showcase for faculty talent on a scale heretofore unknown, as well as a testament to the practical utility of research and scholarship. Between 1930-1935, forty-one private and state-supported universities examined by Orr (1978) granted nearly 300 leaves to full-time faculty for the expressed purpose of sering the federal government. A much larger number of faculty, particularly those at the larger universities with graduate departments, served state and local governments "on overload." (Orr, 1978). Again, in the early 1940s, it was to academics that the federal government turned in support of the national defense effort and the successful prosecution of of World War II.

This new found visibility and public support contributed immeasurably to the differentiation and upgrading of the faculty role. The esteem in which members of the academic profession were held increased markedly as did the prestige attached to an academic career. Bowen (1978) has documented the close association of public attitudes toward academe and the level of faculty salaries, pinpointing World War II as marking a major upturn in both the level and rate of real growth in faculty salaries. Not only did the salaries sharply increase, but growing attention was focused on the economic security of faculty members. Professors had initally been excluded from the Social Security program and only a very small group were covered by the Carnegie Corporation's faculty pension program, created in 1906 and by this time effectively closed. The 1930s witnessed the widespread establishment of faculty retirement plans, including incorporation of the Teacher's Insurance Annuity Association. In 1934, about 40% of faculty were covered; and by the commencement of World War II, the proportion had increased to nearly three-fifths (Orr, 1978).

On their own campuses, professors' claim to expertise translated into the bargaining power necessary to markedly improve their lot. It was during this period that the quest for job security was satisfied. In its 1950 statement on tenure, culminating fourteen years of discussion, the American Association of University Professors articulated the judicial concept of permanent faculty tenure, designed a means for regularizing the flow of tenure decisionmaking (i.e., by stipulating the six year "probationary period") and assuring due process on non-reappointment. And, by that time, the AAUP had sufficient stature to gain widespread institutional acceptance of its pronouncement (Metzger, 1971)

It was during this period as well that recognition of faculty as "professionals" was reflected in their increasing role in institutional decision making. The 1930's saw the blossoming of faculty committee structures at nearly all institutions. By 1939, Haggerty and Works found over two-fifths of their sample of North Central Association faculty serving on an average of two committees each. Through such committees, faculty came to share increasingly in institutional administration and, in a more limited way, in the formulation of education policy.* These developments culminated in the report of Committee T of AAUP in November, 1937 which set forth five overarching principals for faculty participation in institutional governance. Taken together, the principals mandate a role for the faculty in the selection of administrators, in the formulation and control of educational policy, and in the appointment and promotion process. While the role assigned to the faculty is largely

---

*Two-thirds of the then extant committees were primarily administrative in function, while only a fifth focused on educational policy per se.

consultive, the document had at its core the conviction that "faculty were not hired employees to be manipulated by president and trustees, but were academic professionals whose role involved teaching and contributing to the direction and major decisions of an institution." (Orr, 1978, pp. 347-348).

The growing recognition of faculty as professionals served not only to elevate the profession, but also to broaden entry to it. Professionalization permitted, although it by no means assured, the introduction of achievement-related criteria of success--the merit principal--and a concommitant reduction in the salience of ascriptive criteria of class origin (gentlemanliness) and religious orthodoxy. The relaxation of barriers to entry as well as the profession's growing, though by no means great, prestige infused new blood into the academy: by World War II, Catholics and Jews constituted nearly one quarter of a heretofore exclusively Protestant profession and the offspring of mid Atlantic and upper midwestern states were supplanting New Englanders. The sons of farmers and manual laborers now constituted over one-third of the professoriate and daughters were now joining the sons (fully thirteen percent of a sample North Central Association institutions examined by Kunkel, 1938).

This more heterogeneous faculty was encountering a different type of student body--in a very different way. The Great Depression turned an entire student generation from football and student life to the college library and their studies, from liquor and sex to economics. And, in response to this greater seriousness, faculty members became more interested in effective teaching (Orr, 1978). If the Depression contributed to a general climate in which an unprecedented confluence

of student and faculty interest was possible, at least one government program worked in a very specific way to encourage closer working relationships between many students and faculty. The National Youth Administration, authorized by the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935, gave part-time work to college and university students in order to allow them to remain in college (and in fact discourage them from joining the already long unemployment lines). Fully one-third of the more than 100,000 students involved in the program worked directly with faculty members on research projects, or on department service activities, e.g., preparing supplemental teaching materials, compiling bibliographies, cataloging documents from museums, pieces, etc, (Orr, 1978, pp. 261-63). These externally structured working relationships, embedded in a climate of economic uncertainty and perversity for all, had by the late 1930s transformed an historically adversary relationship of two hundred years standing toward the closer, more supportive faculty-student relationship with which we are familiar today.

By the end of World War II, the components of the modern academic role had clearly emerged and crystalized into the thoroughly professionalized model of role requirements by which we recognize the professor today--teaching, research, student advisement, administration, institutional and public service. Since its initial crystalization, the model has shown remarkable durability. Over thirty-five years and enormous fluctuations in the fortunes of American higher education, it has only come to more fully approach its ideal typical expression--greater emphasis on research productivity, fuller participation in academic citizenship, and fuller development of the public role of the academic.

SOME GENERALIZATIONS ABOUT CONTEMPORARY COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY FACULTY

What can we now say about the practitioner of this modern academic role? The social science research reviewed permits generalization in at least three areas: the distinctive characteristics of academic vis-a-vis other workers; the commonalities academics share with the "general population"; and the sources and dimensions of diversity within the academy itself.

The Distinctive Character of Academic Workers: Sources of Motivation and Satisfaction

In at least one fundamental respect, professors are a world apart from most other workers--their on-the-job performance is determined to an extraordinary degree by their own professional values and standards. Studies of faculty performance lend strong support to the proposition that in acquitting themselves of their core academic obligations of teaching and research, faculty are most influenced by their own internalized standards for professional performance. At the same time, their activity pattern appears to be relatively impervious to the performance demands reflected in institutional incentive structures--notwithstanding the likelihood of "pay off," research-oriented faculty tend to do research, and teaching oriented faculty tend to devote themselves to teaching (whatever their institutions may want them to do).

Two studies explicitly focus on the relationship of institutional reward structures to faculty self-reported activity preferences. Hind (1969,1971) examined faculty activity patterns at Stanford University in an effort to test Scott and Dornbusch's theory of the "controlling"

influence of organizational reward systems on employee activity patterns in an academic setting. Although nearly four-fifths of the faculty sample viewed research as having supreme influence on the distribution of organizational rewards, they still reported spending more of their time on teaching-related activities (which only 20% viewed as likely to pay off). While Hind presents evidence suggesting that faculty were aware of the imbalance and sought to redress it, it is, nonetheless, apparent from the data that nearly one-half of those faculty who did not see teaching as paying off spent more time than most of their colleagues engaged in it. Hind is thus led to conclude that while faculty activity patterns may, to some extent, be a function of "perceived pay off," they are also subject to the individual's "sense of professional responsibility and internalized standards for effort." Apparently, then, faculty feel an obligation to teach irrespective of the value placed on teaching by others.

In a study of faculty at Indiana University, Borland (1970) found that the perceived payoff of various faculty work activities was largely independent of the time and effort allocated to them. Among those faculty who viewed research as a rewarded activity, just as many spent a minor as a major portion of their time on it. If not the reward system, what emerged as the central locus of control of faculty activity patterns? Not work load assignment--Borland found that faculty themselves had the most influence over the allocation of their own professional duties so that work load assignments, to a great extent, reflected their own individual predilections. Nor did institutional goals prove a controlling influence--faculty perception of a goal as "primary" was not associated with their spending a major portion of their time on it. Moreover,

those faculty who spent the major portion of their time on any given activity (teaching, research, service) were no more likely to perceive it as a primary institutional goal than those who spent a minor portion of their time on it. Faculty, Borland is led to conclude, basically do what they want. Their personal and professional goals become the operational goals of the university, and are reflected both in workload assignment and activity patterns.

These conclusions are by and large supported by DeVries' (1970,1975) exploration of the impact of expectations of the faculty member's role set (colleagues, chairperson, institution and self) on his/her allocation of effort. DeVries reported that an individual faculty member's "self-expectations" were by far the best predictor of his/her activity patterns, uniquely explaining between 30% and 43% of the variance in time allocation among the three core role components of teaching, research, administration. Organizational expectations, as reflected in FTE work load assignment, ran a distant second, uniquely explaining between 9% and 23% of the activity variance. Colleague and chairperson expectations had virtually no independent effect, explaining from 0 to 3% of the variance. These findings suggest that, contrary to Borland, assigned work load does indeed play a role independent of self-expectations in determining faculty activity patterns (albeit a less important one). Why the discrepancy? It may well be a function of the extent of faculty control over work load assignment. The faculty in Borland's sample showed a high degree of control over their work load assignment, thus effectively subjugating it to their "self-expectations." DeVries, on the other hand, found that the common variance explained by the pair was minimal (ranging from 3% to 8%), suggesting that among his

sample of faculty, FTE assignment did not largely reflect faculty self expectations. Thus, it may be that the import of work load assignment relative to faculty self-expectations varies by "extent of faculty control over work load assignment." In those cases where control over work load is high, self expectations dominate; in those situations where it is lower, faculty activity patterns are more likely to be subject to the independent effect of work load assignment.

This conclusion not only appears to have some "face" validity, but is supported by additional evidence. DeVries (1970) found that the predictive power of self expectations and work load assignment varied over the three central components of the academic role. FTE work load assignment showed the strongest relative impact on allocation of effort to administrative tasks, and the lowest relative impact on the allocation of effort in the teaching and research areas. The latter are, of course, the core activities of the professor, and it is in these areas that self expectations are most fully put into practice. Administrative responsibilities would appear to be less central and less flexible, once the individual faculty member has contracted to take them on.

Direct evidence of the decisiveness of "intrinsic" factors in faculty performance of their core academic functions of research and teaching emerges again and again. In his study of academic work, Blau (1973) explored the relationship of the weight of research in promotion to professors' "felt obligation to do research" and their actual involvement in research activity. He found that the weight of research in promotion and faculty felt obligations to engage in research affected actual research involvement only <u>indirectly</u>, not directly as would be expected if incentives were operative. The weight of research in

promotion appeared rather to influence actual research involvement via selection--that is, it directly affected the research qualifications of individual faculty hired and furnished them with highly research-oriented colleagues. Similarly, Behymer (1974, 1975) reported that perceived pressure to publish had no independent effect on faculty research productivity, when individual interest in research was controlled. On the whole, he found that "intrinsic" factors (e.g., interest in research, and interaction with research-oriented colleagues) rather than "extrinsic" factors (e.g., perceived pressure to publish) were the most salient predictors of productivity. Together Blau and Behymer suggest that the dependence of promotion on research productivity does not motivate individuals who are not already inclined to research; rather it raises research productivity by the selection of individuals with research qualifications and orientation and by providing them with stimulating colleagues. Indeed the two variables of colleague climate (proportion of faculty colleagues holding the doctorate) and individual research qualifications (possession of the doctorate) accounted for 30% of the observed variance in research involvement among Blau's sample of faculty. Behymer, adding to the regression analysis several individual characteristics indicative of research orientation/qualification, was able to explain fully 60% of the variance in productivity among faculty.

In their study of faculty-student interaction, Wilson and Gaff (1974) reported that:

1. Faculty personal and professional characteristics were <u>not</u> significantly associated with their frequency of interaction with students related to course work and academic advisement (the most frequently reported categories of interaction). Such interaction appeared

rather to constitute something akin to a requirement of the academic role, and was ipso facto, not subject to much fluctuation owing to personal and extrinsic factors

2. In those areas where interaction might be considered "discretionary"--career advice, personal counseling, discussion of campus issues, and personal friendship--and showed considerable variation, faculty behavior was determined largely by the individual's own conception of the proper role or value of interaction in the learning process--an internal standard.

This "intrinsic" explanation of faculty-student interaction is supported by Gamson's (1964, 1966) study of natural and social scientists at a small, general education college within a large state university. Gamson found that the two disciplinary groupings were differentiated by their distinctive normative orientations to education, including differing conceptions of students, educational objectives, and norms for student-faculty relations. And indeed, each of these normative orientations was directly translated into a distinctive pattern of interaction: natural scientists tended to be more task-oriented and less selective in their contacts, focusing on the "average" student, while social scientists tended to be more socio-emotionally oriented and personalistic in their contacts, focusing on the more "interesting" students.

Additional supportive evidence is provided by Lodahl and Gordon (1972). They compared patterns of interaction with graduate students of faculty from disciplines differing in their level of paradigm development.*

---

*Level of paradigm development is defined in the Kuhnian sense of "degree of consensus" on theoretical frameworks and research procedures.

Faculty in fields characterized by a relatively high level of paradigm development (chemistry and physics) showed significantly lower conflict over time spent with graduate students, and exhibited significantly higher willingness to help graduate students in their research than those faculty in fields characterized by a lower level of paradigm development (sociology and political science). Indeed, at elite institutions, where faculty are most autonomous, the differences proved to be most pronounced. In explaining these findings, Lodahl and Gordon suggested that the higher degree of consensus with respect to research priorities and procedures among faculty in more highly developed fields facilitates task-related interaction, and the conception of graduate students as colleagues. Thus, patterns of faculty-student interaction emerge as an intrinsic consequence of the nature of disciplinary tasks; and, where faculty are freest to do as they please--at elite universities--these intrinsic consequences assert themselves even more powerfully. It would appear then, that a faculty member's interaction with students, no less than his/her general activity patterns and productivity in research, is a function of internal standards of performance.

Finally, this "intrinsic" quality of faculty motivation is reflected in the patterns of faculty satisfaction with their work. Research on faculty mobility (Stecklein and Lathrop, 1960; Cammack, 1965; Brown, 1967; Nicholson, 1970; McGee, 1971) and job and career satisfaction (Stecklein and Eckert, 1958; Whitlock, 1965; Swierenga, 1970; Avakian, 1971; Eckert and Williams, 1972; Leon, 1973) suggests that faculty tend to find satisfaction in the nature of their work itself, while their dissatisfaction centers largely on extrinsic factors (e.g., facilities, administration, etc). The distinctiveness of these findings

becomes clearer when they are considered in the context of recent research on job satisfaction. Weaver (1978) recently completed a national study of the level and sources of job satisfaction among professional and non-professional workers. He reported the usual high correlation between overall level of job satisfaction and occupational status, i.e., those in higher status, professional lines of work tend to express the highest overall level of job satisfaction. He did, however, uncover marked differences in the sources of job satisfaction. Among lower status workers and laborers, what job satisfaction they experienced was attributable to the nature of the work itself, while dissatisfaction tended to focus on extrinsic factors, such as money and the lower social status of their occupations. The higher overall level of job satisfaction among professional workers, on the other hand, was largely attributable to their satisfaction with the perquisites of professional work (high salary, social status, autonomy, etc); indeed, their major source of dissatisfaction seemed to rest with the nature of the work they performed. If Weaver is indeed correct, then faculty, as a group, appear to share with other professional workers the high overall level of job satisfaction, while at the same time sharing with lower status workers and laborers their distinctive pattern of sources of job satisfaction.

The Professor as Everyman

If faculty emerge as a "distinctive species" in their academic motivations and satisfaction, they appear, in certain other fundamental respects, to closely resemble other, less-exalted segments of the general population. This "commonality" is no more apparent than in professorial conduct in the social and political spheres of professional life. No

less than the larger society, the professoriate employs "particularistic" as well as "universalistic" criteria in the allocation of status. How far an individual rises in the estimation of his professional colleagues may depend on the prestige and visibility afforded by his institutional affiliation (Crane 1970) or the prominence and power of his contacts (Cameron, 1978) as well as scholarly merit. Achieving a position at the right institution may follow more closely upon one's social class origin (Crane, 1969) and the prestige of one's doctoral institution (Hargens and Hagstrom, 1967; Crane, 1970; Lightfield, 1971) than on either the quality or number of one's scholarly publications. And once there, one's promotion and salary increases may be tied more closely to longevity/seniority than to productivity (Astin and Bayer, 1973; Hargens and Farr, 1973).

As academic citizens, faculty respond to politically charged situations encountered in professional life (e.g., student demonstrations, the prospect of unionization) much as any other citizens do--on the basis of their prior political socialization and their position within the academic stratification system rather than on the basis of their professional socialization to the values of merit and academic freedom. Attitudes toward the prospect of unionization (McInnis, 1972; Ladd and Lipset, 1973) and toward student disruptions (Cole and Adamsons, 1969; Wences and Abramson, 1972) appear to hinge much more on a professor's general political leanings (relative liberalism) and institutional status than on an assessment of probable impacts on the functioning of the academic community. Moreover, professorial commitment to academic values as well as behavioral follow-through on value commitments varies as a function of available social support. Cole and Adamsons (1969,

1970) reported that faculty were significantly less likely to act out their ideological opposition to student demonstrations if their immediate colleagues favored them. Both Lazarsfeld and Thielens (1958) and Goldblatt (1964, 1967) reported that the commitment of social scientists to the tenets of academic freedom appeared to fluctuate with the degree of social support for academic freedom among institutional colleagues. Indeed, they found vacillation in the commitment to academic freedom as individuals, over the course of their career, moved to different institutions providing differential colleague support for that fundamental doctrine of the profession. To be sure, there are exceptions to these generalizations about academic citizenship--the ideal-typical professor, the productive scholar at the apex of the academic stratification system, has more fully operationalized academic values in the political and social life of his/her profession. S/he, mandarin though s/he be, tends to be at once politically liberal and tolerant while asserting academic values over political ones. The typical professor, however, appears to act out his/her citizenship in the academic polity much as his/her neighbor does in the larger socio-political system.

Yet another fundamental respect in which faculty resemble "everyman" is that, like other adults, they grow and change over the course of their career. Indeed, <u>age</u> emerges as the single most important source of individual change over the course of the academic career. It accounts for statistically significant variation in over half of the twenty-six dependent variables treated in the research literature, while changes in professional status, e.g., rank and tenure, significantly affect barely one-third. Most notably, age is associated with increased

conservatism (Spaulding et al., 1968; Berger, 1973; Ladd and Lipset, 1975), decreased research orientation and productivity (Behymer, 1974; Fulton and Trow, 1974) and a heightened orientation toward teaching (Kelly and Hart 1971; Klapper, 1969; Baldwin, 1979), albeit without any perceptible increase in teaching effectiveness. In the absence of longitudinal data, it is, strictly speaking, impossible to disentangle the effects of aging per se from those attributable to generational differences among age cohorts studied cross-sectionally, let alone to specify precisely what it is about growing older that affects how faculty think and what they do. However, Baldwin's (1979) recent study of faculty at different career stages suggests that much of the "impact of age" is a function of the developmental changes that psychologists have shown to characterize growth during the adult years (Levinson, 1978).

Finally, faculty may be seen, in a more limited fashion, to resemble that sector of the population engaged in "professional" occupations in the centrality of the work role. Academic work, like other professional work, tends to be pre-emptive and overshadow the individual's family and personal life (Kistler, 1967; Lee, 1968; Parsons and Platt, 1968; Friedman, 1971). While a number of studies conclude that academic work, in contradistinction to that of other professions, tends to foster a distinctive species of lifestyle, the relationship appears to be largely spurious. What differences are discernible between academics and other professionals--their relatively higher degree of ethnic/religious assimilation, their greater liberalism, and predilection for "high culture"--seem to be more attributable to selection than socialization factors. Available evidence on the timing of changes in religiosity (Thalheimer, 1963, 1965) and political orientation (Ladd and

Lipset, 1975) suggests that faculty religious and political predilections were largely formed before entry into the academic profession. Changes occurring later are more likely attributable to adult socialization processes quite independent of the academic context (Mazur, 1969, 1971). Thus, academics tend to be very different types of people from other professionals, and these long-standing differences rather than the character of academic work and its environment account for any distinctiveness vis-a-vis other professionals.

The Divided Academy

Thus far, we have discussed faculty almost as if they constituted a single, cohesive social group. But, if the findings of research on college and university faculty suggest anything, it is that faculty are as different from each other as they are from the population at large. Indeed, the professoriate may be less a social species than a genus encompassing several distinct species. At the very least, both institutional type and prestige and academic discipline may be seen to differentiate among species of academic man. Fulton and Trow (1974) suggest that the academic role itself as a pattern of activities may be a very different phenomenon at different types of institutions--at elite universities, the role appears to be a more integrated one, combining nearly equal measures of teaching, research, administration, and service; at less prestigious undergraduate institutions, the role tends to be more lopsided, variously emphasizing one core function over another. And institutional type/prestige accounts for statistically significant variation in virtually every dependent variable that has come under investigative scrutiny. Among various disciplinary groupings, we find

differential normative orientations to education (Gamson, 1966), differential commitment to traditional academic values e.g., academic freedom (Lazarfeld and Thielens, 1958; Lewis, 1966) and differential emphases on the components of the academic role (Biglan, 1971; Blau, 1973; Fulton and Trow, 1974). Research is a different kind of activity for natural scientists than it is for humanists, or professional school faculty, as is teaching (Biglan, 1971; Morgan, 1971) and interaction with students takes very different forms and appears to have very different meanings among the three groups (Gamson, 1967; Gaff and Wilson, 1975). These differences appear as well to carry over into the broader personal and family life of faculty (Thalheimer, 1963; Kistler, 1967; Steinberg, 1974; Ladd and Lipset, 1975).

How can we account for this extraordinary internal differentiation among the professoriate? While the available evidence is meager, it does suggest that both selection and professional socialization factors are at work. Differential selection to institutional types and disciplinary groups may be more crucial since socialization appears to be "selective"--that is, insofar as the norms associated with professional socialization are congruent with the individual's pre-entry values and predilections, professional socialization appears to reinforce those values and predilections. Insofar, however, as professional norms and pre-entry values are not congruent, then professional socialization appears to have very little effect indeed (Thalheimer, 1963, 1965, 1973; Spaulding et al., 1968; Ladd and Lipset, 1975).*

---

*Thus, the phenomenon of the reactionary sociologist and the radical agronomist or accountant.

At the institutional level, the major socializing force appears to be "colleague climate" (Lazarsfeld and Thielens, 1958; Blau, 1973) i.e., the qualifications and orientations of the focal individual's colleagues. At the disciplinary level, no claims have yet been made for the influence of "colleague climate"; rather, investigators have sought to locate the socializing influence of academic disciplines in their structural characteristics. This effort has yielded a series of bi-polar continua upon which individual disciplines can be located: hard vs. soft (methodological rigor); theoretical vs. applied; high vs. low level of paradigm development (degree of consensus on theoretical frameworks and research procedures). While the location of a focal discipline on any one or all of these bi-polar continua appears to have some predictive value, we do not appear to be even close to understanding how the various disciplinary groupings operate, independently of selection factors, to affect how faculty think and what they do. Whatever the explanation(s) might be, one point is eminently clear: to attempt to generalize about faculty as a group may not be intellectually defensible, except in the broadest possible way. Indeed, it may be that both valid and meaningful generalizations can only be drawn about each of the various species.

THE CHARACTER OF RESEARCH ON AMERICAN ACADEMICS

Having presented the generalized results of research on modern academics, we turn now to an examination of several characteristics of the studies themselves that affect the types of understandings they furnish. Those characteristics include:

1) A highly "topical" orientation--While twenty-three dependent variables were examined across the group of over two hundred studies, each focused on an average of 1.3 dependent variables (i.e., the entire group of studies treated a total of 308 dependent variables). Indeed, a twenty-six year hiatus separated the publication of Logan Wilson's seminal study of the academic career and the publication of Parsons' and Platt's comprehensive pilot study of the academic professions (Parsons and Platt, 1968). Since the work of Parsons and Platt, only Nevitt Sanford and his associates at the Wright Institute had launched another comprehensive effort at understanding the life and work experience of college and university faculty (Freedman, 1973; Brown and Shukraft, 1974).

2) A focus on faculty attitudes or performance outcomes as dependent variables rather than faculty behaviors-- An examination of Table I suggests that about three-fourths of the research effort has focused on attitudes, values, orientations and performance outcomes (e.g., teaching effectiveness, research productivity, receipt of rewards/ recognition) and barely one-fourth on actual behavior (e.g., mobility, faculty-student interaction).

3) A focus on institutional and professional characteristics as independent variables--Investigators have tended to seek explanations of faculty attitudes and performance outcomes in the latter's association with "enduring" individual and institutional characteristics (e.g., faculty professional and organizational statuses and ascriptive, social characteristics such as age and sex; institutional type and quality), treated as exogenous variables.

TABLE I

THE DISTRIBUTION OF DEPENDENT VARIABLES
INVESTIGATED ACROSS ALL STUDIES

DEPENDENT VARIABLE	% OF ALL DEPENDENT VARIABLES INVESTIGATED (N=308)
Academic Career:	
Career Choice	4.2
Professional orientation (locus of loyalties)	5.8
Educational & professional values	4.9
Morale & satisfaction	12.3
Distribution of rewards & recognition	6.8
Interinstitutional mobility	6.5
Career adjustment	1.3
Perception of institution	1.6
Subtotal	43.5
Faculty Performance:	
Overall performance (Distribution of effort)	6.2
Teaching effectiveness	8.4
Research productivity	11.4
Administrative & other activities	0.6
Faculty-student interaction	4.2
Colleague relations	0.3
Faculty-administrator relations	1.3
Attitudes toward governance	3.9
Attitude toward collective bargaining	3.6
Attitudinal tolerance of campus protest	1.3
Role conflict	2.3
Subtotal	43.5
Faculty Lifestyles:	
Political orientation	5.2
Religious-ethnic orientation	3.9
Family & community life	1.6
Personality	2.3
Subtotal	13.0
Total	100.0

4) A reliance on the one-shot survey as the modal research strategy--Nearly seven-eights of the studies employ one or another variation of the social survey, with nearly two-thirds employing the one-shot case study.

5) Lack of a theoretical base--A plurality of studies (28%) employed no theoretical base and only about one-half explicitly tested a set of hypotheses derived from theory or the findings of previous research. Among the theoretically based studies are represented a tremendous diversity of individual theories and frameworks--with no modal theory/framework emerging in the research directed at any one dependent variable.

Collectively, these characteristics suggest that the paradigm for inquiry on college and university faculty to date might be represented thusly:

INSTITUTIONAL AND INDIVIDUAL CHARACTERISTICS (EXOGENOUS) ⟶ FACULTY ATTITUDE AND/OR PERFORMANCE OUTCOME

The individual professor is viewed as classifiable along several status dimensions, and investigators have sought for the most part to determine the constancies between status dimensions and faculty attitudes and performance outcomes.

The consequences of such a research paradigm for understanding faculty are severalfold. In the first place, very little light can be shed on the social psychological processes that produce performance outcomes and that mediate the translation of attitudinal predispositions into behavior. Thus, while studies of research productivity and teaching effectiveness abound, the description and explanation of the conduct of

inquiry and of classroom teaching practices remain at a rudimentary stage of development.* While we know something about the determinants of how much influence faculty wield in institutional governance, we know much less about how that influence is exercised.**

In the second place, the paradigm emphasizes establishing the fact of relationships (or in cases of multivariate analysis, a "pecking order" of facts) at the expense of establishing their direction or explanation. The modal one-shot survey does not permit a reliable assessment of direction--it neither controls nor observes the time order of independent and dependent variables (Denzin, 1978). Investigators have tended to assume that relationships are uni-directional, and in the logically expected direction. Such assumptions are rarely theoretically based or tested. Thus, for example, the correlational studies of personality and teaching effectiveness (Bendig, 1955; Maslow and Zimmerman, 1956; Usher, 1966; Sorey, 1967; Choy, 1969; King, 1971; Stuntebeck, 1974; Sherman and Blackburn, 1975) showed a strong relationship between the two variables; yet the residual question of direction pressed for resolution--are personality traits causally related to teaching effectivness, or are effective teachers merely perceived as effective people? And which of these propositions mirrors the "true" direction of the relationship has enormous implications for efforts at the improvement of teaching. Similarly, in formulating explanations for the fact

---

*In the case of research activity, Crane (1964), Biglan (1971) and Glueck and Jauch (1975) are exceptions; in the case of classroom teaching behavior Mann et al (1970), Freedman (1973) and Gaff and Wilson (1975) are the major exceptions.

**Parsons and Platt (1968), Baldridge (1971) and Baldrige et al. (1978) are exceptions that come to mind.

of a relationship, investigators have tended to fall back on "reasoned" conjecture--most frequently the probable influence of professional socialization. Very few studies have sought to conceptualize and test alternative explanations of the focal relationship as an intrinsic part of their research design. And what "explanation testing" there has been is a very recent phenomenon.* Thus, despite a large number of studies corroborating any one focal relationship, the "why" of that relationship remains a continuing matter of conjecture.

Quite beyond these consequences, the paradigm is weakened to the extent that the concepts employed by investigators are vague and underdeveloped. Elsewhere, I have discussed the conceptual inconsistencies affecting research on faculty mobility as well as the lack of a satisfactorily complex conceptualization of mobility processes (Finkelstein, 1978, pp. 164-93). I have also alluded earlier to the disinclination of researchers thus far to grapple with the concept of teaching effectiveness (V. supra and Finkelstein, 1978 pp. 273-96).** By and large, investigators have not tended to pay sufficient attention to the development of meaningful, indigenous concepts for the study of faculty. Indeed, few indigenous concepts have emerged from the study of faculty since the late fifties. In their study of the response of social scientists to the threat of McCarthyism, Lazarsfeld and Thielens (1958) empirically derived from their survey data the twin constructs of "apprehension" (an index

---

*Bayer and Dutton (1975), for example, tested seven curves hypothesizing the relationship between age and scholarly productivity to determine the one(s) that "best fit" their data while Ladd and Lipset (1975) examined faculty political orientation in relationship to independent variables suggested by several competing theories of political socialization.

**Surely teaching effectiveness is something more than the dozen or so items on a student course evaluation form.

of faculty attitudinal worry as well as behavioral manifestations of caution) and "permissiveness" (attitudinal and behavioral tolerance of deviance). About the same time, Gouldner (1957, 1958) set out to empirically validate the concept of cosmopolitanism-localism, borrowed from Merton's Social Theory and Social Structure (1957). In the intervening two decades, Lazarsfeld and Thielens' constructs have lain largely dormant; Gouldner's, on the other hand, has become virtually institutionalized--in virtually every area of inquiry, investigators have pressed the cosmopolitan-local construct into service as an independent variable. This persists despite evidence that cosmopolitanism and localism vary independently (Razak, 1969; Warriner and Murai, 1973). What concepts have informed research, then, are, for the most part, borrowed from the social sciences. In the process of borrowing, however, investigators have not always proved faithful to the original "concept-in-context." Thus, the multi-dimensional construct of "religiosity" developed by sociologists of religion has been reduced to the "frequency of faculty church attendance" (Gaff and Wilson, 1975; Ladd and Lipset, 1975). In transplanting French and Raven's (1960) notion of the five bases of influence/power, investigators have not brought with it a conception of social influence and its distinction from social power; nor have they addressed the issue of the generalizability of modes of social influence across the governance spectrum (an issue upon which the utility of their findings clearly depends). Many more examples might be cited. The point, however, seems clear: to the extent that concepts are weak, the findings upon which they are based can be no stronger.

DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

In the course of presenting generalizations about faculty and the research literature, we have highlighted various implications, gaps, and incongruities. On the basis of these we are now in a position to suggest those broad directions for future research which can be expected to yield the types of knowledge that will broaden and deepen our understanding of the modern academic role.

In the first place, it would appear necessary to build as much as possible on already available research. The inquiry upon which this monograph rests has taken a first step in that direction by organizing the corpus of extant research. At least two further tasks remain.

First, systematic effort need be directed toward drawing out and testing the implications of already extant findings--a task upon which we have only barely touched. In this connection, two specific findings seem to merit special attention. That faculty performance in their core academic functions of teaching and research appears to be influenced primarily by internalized professional standards and seems to be relatively impervious to extrinsic incentives raises serious questions about the fundamental assumptions undergirding statewide as well as institutional efforts to improve teaching and research performance, often subsumed under the rubric of "faculty development." If academics are indeed socialized into a remarkably stable/durable conception of their role in the course of graduate education, and if, too, they appear to be "selectively" subject to only those influences that are congruent with their basic orientations, then current incentive approaches are likely to miss their mark.

The finding that age seems to account for fundamental change in faculty takes on added meaning as we consider the ever-increasing mean age of the professoriate (Ladd and Lipset, 1975). What are the implications for the higher education enterprise of an older faculty who show decreased research orientation and an increased orientation to teaching without any perceptible change in teaching effectiveness in times that demand accountability, and who show increased conservatism in a time when new student clienteles and educational purposes are requiring profound transformations? Clearly, the faculty of the 1980s and 1990s will represent a different mix of developmental needs and will require a different mix of faculty development strategies (Baldwin, 1979).

Second, systematic effort ought to be directed to the exploration and further specification of those already well established, but barely understood, relationships which have emerged in the research literature, e.g., the association of personality and teaching effectiveness, that of disciplinary affiliation and most dimensions of academic performance and values. In most cases, only the fact of these relationships have been established--the question of their direction and their explanation remain.

At the same time, the immediately preceding analysis suggests that new directions need to be struck. Most fundamentally, investigators will need to begin to systematically describe and classify faculty behavior--a task that after three decades of research yet remains to be initiated on a large scale. No doubt, in thus "getting back to basics" a variety of new, indigenous concepts for understanding faculty will emerge. Indeed, the development of precise and meaningful concepts, whether derived from direct observations or borrowed from the social

sciences, must command the highest priority--to the extent that concept development is successfully pursued, and only to that extent, will theory in the realm of faculty behavior become a distinct possibility.

Finally, future inquiry may need to be guided by new notions of sampling in at least two respects. To date, research on faculty has tended to focus on the individual as the unit of analysis. To the extent, however, that we seek to illuminate academic work as a social process, then it may be necessary to adopt what Denzin (1978) has called "interactive" sampling models, i.e., the sampling of natural interaction units rather than individuals. Thus, for example, if we are to develop understanding of teaching activity, it may prove more useful to examine classroom units or student/faculty conferences (the actual locus of teaching activity) than individual faculty members.*

While individual inquiries have, by and large, persisted in focusing on the individual as the unit of analysis, they have, over time, tended to expand the scope of the faculty populations sampled, including ever broader representation of institutional types and academic fields. It may be that this expansiveness has been counter-productive. The greater the number of species of academic man subsumed in any given inquiry, the greater the likelihood that the investigator is struck by the global differences among species, and the lesser the likelihood that s/he will penetrate the mysteries of any one species. Indeed, previous research suggests just such a pattern: while researchers have been eminently successful in identifying the bases for species differentiation (be it

---

*Mann et al (1970) have already made an important start in this direction as have Nevitt Sanford and his colleagues at the Wright Institute (Freedman, 1973).

discipline or institutional type), they have not pursued in any depth an understanding of any one individual species. Future investigators may, then, find it more fruitful to hone in on one or another homogeneous cluster of faculty, rather than allow themselves to be caught up in the process of clustering itself.

To the extent that even some of the directions charted above are pursued, our understanding of college and university faculty will no doubt be both broadened and deepened. We may yet arrive at the goal envisioned by Gustad (1961) in an early assessment of the status of research on American academics: "To speak only when the data speak and remain silent when the data are silent"--and yet be able to speak.

REFERENCES

Astin, Helen S. and Alan E. Bayer. "Sex Discrimination in Academe." In Academic Women on the Move, edited by Alice Rossi and Ann Calderwood. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1973.

Avakian, A. Nancy. "An Analysis of Factors Relating to the Job Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of Faculty Members in Institutions of Higher Education." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, State University of New York at Albany, 1971.

Baldridge, J. Victor. Power and Conflict in the University. New York: Wiley, 1971.

Baldridge, J. Victor et al. Policy Making and Effective Leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

Baldwin, Roger. "The Faculty Career Process--Continuity and Change: A Study of College Professors at Five Stages of the Academic Career." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1979.

Bayer, Alan E. and Jeffrey E. Dutton. "Career Age and Research-Professional Activities of Academic Scientists." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C. April 1975.

Behymer, Charles E. "Institutional and Personal Correlates of Faculty Productivity." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1974.

Behymer, Charles E. and Robert T. Blackburn. "Environmental and Personal Attributes Related to Faculty Productivity." Research In Education. 10(August 1975): 104-105.

Bendig, A.W. "Ability and Personality Characteristics of Introductory Psychology Instructors Rated Competent and Empathic by Students." Journal of Educational Research 48 (1955): 705-709.

Berelson, Bernard. Graduate Education in the United States. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.

Berger, James. "Conservatism and the American Professoriate." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Connecticut, 1973.

Biglan, Anthony. "The Relationship of University Department Organization to the Characteristics of Academic Tasks." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation University of Illinois, 1971.

Blau, Peter M. The Organization of Academic Work. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1973.

Borland, David. "The University as an Organization: An Analysis of the Faculty Rewards System." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1970.

Bowen, Howard. Faculty Compensation. New York: Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association, 1978.

Brown, David G. The Mobile Professors. Washington, D.C.: The American Council on Education, 1967.

Brown, J. Wesley and Robert C. Shukraft. "Personal Development & Professional Practice in College and University Professors." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Graduate Theological Union, 1974.

Cameron, Susan W. "Women Faculty in Academia: Sponsorship, Informal Networks, and Career Success." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1978.

Cammack, E.F. "A Study of Factors Related to Mobility and Faculty Productivity and Achievement at Michigan State University: A Follow-up Study." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1965.

Canby, Henry Seidel. Alma Mater. New York: Farrar and Rinehart, 1936.

Choy, Chunghoon. "The Relationship of College Teacher Effectiveness to Conceptual Systems Orientation and Perceptual Orientation." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Colorado State College, 1969.

Cole, Stephen, and Hannelore Adamsons. "Determinants of Faculty Support for Student Demonstrations." Sociology of Education, 42(Fall, 1969): 315-329.

Cole, Stephen and Hannelore Adamsons. "Professional Status and Faculty Support of Student Demonstrations. Public Opinion Quarterly 34 (Fall 1970): 389-394.

Crane, Diana M. "The Environment of Discovery: A Study of Academic Research Interests and their Setting." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1964.

Crane, Diana. "Social Class Origin and Academic Success: The Influence of Two Stratification Systems on Academic Careers." Sociology of Education 42 (Winter 1969): 1-17.

Crane, Diana. "The Academic Marketplace Revisited: A Study of Faculty Mobility Using the Carter Ratings." American Journal of Sociology 75 (May 1970): 953-964.

Curtis, David V. "Types of Faculty Participation in Academic Governance." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1972.

DeVries, David L. "The Relationship of Departmental and Personal Role Expectations to the Role Behaviors of University Faculty Members." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois, 1970.

DeVries, David L. "The Relationship of Role Expectations to Faculty Behavior." Research in Higher Education 3(1975): 111-29.

Denzin, Norman K. The Research Act. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1978.

Eckert, Ruth E., and Howard Y. Williams. College Faculty View Themselves and Their Jobs. Minneapolis: College of Education, University of Minnesota, 1972.

Erikson, Erik H. Identity: Youth and Crisis. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1968.

Finkelstein, Martin. "Three Decades of Research on American Academics: A Descriptive Portrait and Synthesis of Findings." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, S.U.N.Y. at Buffalo, 1978.

Freedman, Mervin (ed.). Facilitating Faculty Development. New Directions for Higher Education, No. 1. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

French, J.R. and B. Raven. "The Bases of Social Power." In Group Dynamics, edited by D. Cartwright and A. Zander. Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson and Company, 1960.

Friedman, Norman L. "Jewish or Professorial Identity? The Priorization Process in Academic Situations." Sociological Analysis 32 (Fall 1971): 149-57.

Fulton, Oliver and Martin Trow. "Research Activity in American Higher Education." Sociology of Education 47 (Winter 1974): 29-73.

Gaff, Jerry G. and Robert C. Wilson. "Faculty Impact on Students." In College Professors and their Impact on Students, by Robert C. Wilson, Jerry G. Gaff, Evelyn R. Dienst, Lynn Wood and James L. Barry. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1975.

Gamson, Zelda. "Social Control and Modification: A Study of Responses to Students in a small Nonresidential College." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1964.

Gamson, Zelda. "Utilitarian and Normative Orientations Toward Education." Sociology of Education 39 (1966): 46-73.

Gamson, Zelda. "Performance and Personalism in Student-Faculty Relations." Sociology of Education 40 (Fall 1967): 279-301.

Glueck, William F. and Lawrence R. Jauch. "Sources of Research Ideas Among Productive Scholars." Journal of Higher Education 46 (January/February 1975): 103-14.

Goldblatt, H.S. "Controversial Teaching, Teachers, and Graduate School: A Continuity in the Study of the Academic Mind.: Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1964.

Goldblatt, H. "Academic Mobility and Cross Pressues on College Teachers During the McCarthy Era." Sociology of Education 40 (Spring 1967): 132-144.

Gouldner, Alvin W. "Cosmopolitans and Locals: Toward an Analysis of Latent Social Roles" I. Administrative Science Quarterly (December 1957): 281-306.

Gouldner, Alvin W. "Cosmopolitans and Locals: Towards an Analysis of Latent Social Roles--II." Administrative Science Quarterly 2 (March 1958): 444-80.

Gustad, John W. "The American College Teacher: An Appraisal and Critique of Research on College Faculty Members." In Studies of College Faculty. Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education, 1961.

Haggerty, William J. and George A. Works. Faculties of Colleges and Universities Accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, 1930-37. Commission on Institutions of Higher Education, publication 12. Chicago: North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, 1939.

Hargens, Lowell L. and Grant M. Farr. "An Examiniation of Recent Hypotheses about Institutional Inbreeding." American Journal of Sociology 78 (May 1973): 1381-1402.

Hargens, Lowell L. and Warren O. Hagstrom. "Sponsored and Contest Mobility of American Academic Scientists." Sociology of Education 40 (Winter 1967): 24-38.

Hind, Robert R. "Evaluation and Authority in a University Faculty." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1969.

Hind, Robert R. "Analysis of a Faculty: Professionalism, Evaluation, and the Authority Structure." In Academic Governance, edited by J. Victor Baldridge. Berkeley, California: McCutchan, 1971.

Kelly, Richard and B. Derrell Hart. "The Role Preferences of Faculty in Different Age Groups and Academic Disciplines." Sociology of Education 44 (Summer 1971): 351-57.

King, Alma P. "The Self-Concept and Self-Actualization of University Faculty in Relation to Student Perceptions of Effective Teaching." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Utah State University, 1971.

Kistler, Robert C. "The University Professor and High Family: A Study of the Duality in Roles." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Maryland, 1967.

Klapper, Hope L. "The Young College Faculty Member--A New Breed?" Sociology of Education 42 (Winter 1969): 38-49.

Kunkel, B.W. "A Survey of College Faculties." AAUP Bulletin 24 (December 1938): 249-62.

Ladd, Everett C. and Seymour M. Lipset. The Divided Academy. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Ladd, Everett C. and Seymour M. Lipset. Professors, Unions, and American Higher Education. Berkeley, California: The Carnegie Commission, 1973.

Lazarsfeld, Paul F. and Wagner Thielens. The Academic Mind. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1958.

Lee, David K. "Marital Disruption among University Physicians and Professors: An Empirical Study of the Relationship Between Professional Activities and Evaluations of Marital Disruption." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Iowa, 1968.

Leon, Julio S. "An Investigation of the Applicability of the Two-Factor Theory of Job Satisfaction among College and University Professors." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Arkansas, 1973.

Levinson, Daniel J. The Seasons of a Man's Life. New York: Knopf, 1978.

Lewis, Lionel. "Faculty Support of Academic Freedom and Self-Government." Social Problems 13 (1966): 450-61.

Lewis, Lionel. Scaling the Ivory Tower. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1975.

Lightfield, E. Timothy. "Output and Recognition of Sociologists." American Sociologist 6 (May 1971): 128-33.

Livesay, Herbert. The Professors. New York: Charterhouse, 1975.

Lodahl, Janice B. and Gerald Gordon. "The Structure of Scientific Fields and the Functioning of University Graduate Departments." American Sociological Review 37 (February 1972): 57-72.

McCaughey, Robert A. "The Transformation of American Academic Life: Harvard University, 1812-1892." Perspectives in American History 8 (1974): 239-332.

McGee, Reece. Academic Janus. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971.

McInnis, Malcolm Cleveland, Jr. "Demographic and Non-Demographic Variables Associated with the Florida State University Faculty Members' Attitudes toward Collective Bargaining in Higher Education." Unpublished Ph.d. dissertation, Florida State University, 1972.

Mann, Richard D. et al. The College Classroom. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1970.

Maslow, A.H. and W. Zimmerman. "College Teaching Ability, Scholarly Activity and Personality." Journal of Educational Psychology 47 (1956): 185-89.

Mazur, Allan C. "Resocialized Ethnicity: A Study of Jewish Social Scientists." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Johns Hopkins University, 1969.

Mazur, Allan C. "The Socialization of Jews into the Academic Subculture." In The Professors, edited by Charles H. Anderson and Hohn D. Murray. Cambridge, Mass: Schenkman Publishing Co., 1971.

Merton, Robert K. Social Theory and Social Structure. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1957.

Metzger, Walter P. "Academic Tenure in America: A Historical Essay." In Commission on Academic Tenure in Higher Education. Faculty Tenure. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

Morgan, Richard H. "The Conflict Between Teaching and Research in the Academic Role." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1970.

Nicholson, Edward A. "Job Decisions of Ohio Liberal Arts College Faculty Members." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio State University, 1970.

Orr, Kenneth B. "The Impact of the Depression Years, 1929-1939, on Faculty in American Colleges and Universities." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1978.

Parsons, Talcott and Gerald M. Platt. The American Academic Profession: A Pilot Study. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 1968.

Razak, Warren N. "Departmental Structure and Faculty Loyalty in a Major University." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Kansas, 1969.

Sherman, Barbara and Robert T. Blackburn. "Personal Characteristics and Teaching Effectiveness of College Faculty." Journal of Educational Psychology 67 (1975): 124-31.

Sorey, Kenneth E. "A Study of the Distinguishing Personality Characteristics of College Faculty who are Superior in Regard to the Teaching Function." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1967.

Spaulding, Charles B. and Henry A. Turner. "Political Orientation and Field of Specialization Among College Professors." Sociology of Education 41 (Summer 1968): 245-62.

Stecklein, John E. and Ruth E. Eckert. An Exploratory Study of Factors Influencing the Choice of College Teaching as a Career. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1958.

Stecklein, John E. and Robert L. Lathrop. Faculty Attraction and Retention: Factors Affecting Faculty Mobility at the University of Minnesota. Minneapolis: Bureau of Institutional Research, University of Minnesota, 1960.

Steinberg, Stephen. The Academic Melting Pot. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.

Stuntebeck, Susan V. "Perceived Need Satisfaction and Teaching Effectiveness: A Study of University Faculty." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Notre Dame, 1974.

Swierenga, Lloyd G. "Application of Herzberg's Dual-Factor Theory to Faculty Members in a University." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Western Michigan University, 1970.

Thalheimer, Fred. "Religiosity in the Academic Profession." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1963.

Thalheimer, Fred. "Continuity and Change in Religiosity: A Study of Academicians." Pacific Sociological Review 8 (Fall 1965): 101-8.

Thalheimer, Fred. "Religiosity and Secularization in the Academic Professions." Sociology of Education 46 (Spring 1973): 183-202.

Tuckman, Howard. Publication, Teaching and the Academic Reward System. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 1976.

Usher, Richard H. "The Relationship of Perception of Self, Others and the Helping Task to Certain Measures of College Faculty Effectiveness." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Florida, 1966.

Veysey, Laurence R. The Emergence of the American University. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.

Warriner, Charles K. and Linda D. Murai. "Factors in Faculty Role Performance: An Examination of the Latent Role Hypothesis." Mimeographed. Lawrence, Kansas: University of Kansas, 1973.

Weaver, Charles N. "Occupational Prestige as a Factor in the Net Relationship Between Occupation and Job Satisfaction." Personnel Psychology 30 (Winter 1977): 607-12.

Wences, Rosalio, and Harold J. Abramson. "Faculty Opinion on the Issues of Job Placement and Dissent in the University." Social Problems 18 (Summer 1971): 27-38.

Whitlock, Gerald H. "The Experiential Bases and Dimensions of Faculty Morale at a State University." Mimeographed. Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee, 1965.

Wilson, Logan. The Academic Man. London: Oxford University Press, 1942.

Wilson, Logan. American Academics. New York: Oxford University Press, 1979.

Wilson, Robert C., Lynn Wood and Jerry G. Gaff. "Social Psychological Accessibility and Faculty-Student Interaction Beyond the Classroom." Sociology of Education 47 (Winter 1974): 74-92.

OCCASIONAL PAPERS SERIES

1. E. D. Duryea, Perceptions of Faculty-Governing Board Relations, 1900-1969 (September 1978)

2. Arthur Levine, The Life and Death of Innovation in Higher Education (December 1978)

3. Peter P. Olevnik, A Guide to Reference Sources in Higher Education (July 1979)

4. E. D. Duryea, Prologue to the American System of Higher Education: Higher Learning in Western Culture (July 1979)

5. Philip G. Altbach, The Academic Profession: Perspectives on an International Crisis (with Bibliography) (October 1979)

These papers are available for $3 (prepaid) from the Department of Higher Education. Please make check out to "Faculty of Educational Studies."

DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION
FACULTY OF EDUCATIONAL STUDIES
479 CHRISTOPHER BALDY HALL
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT BUFFALO
BUFFALO, NEW YORK 14260